UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/843,051	04/26/2001	Martin T. Gerber	P008433.00CIP1	8909	
64619 CAMPRELL 1	7590 07/31/200 NELSON WHIPPS, LL		EXAM	EXAMINER	
408 ST. PETE			EVANISKO, GE	EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT	
SUITE 240 ST. PAUL, MN 55102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,,,,,,,			3762		
		•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/31/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/843,051	GERBER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit		
		George R. Evanisko	3762		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
VVHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAINS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ware to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133)		
Status		•			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 Ap</u>	oril 2007.			
·	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.		
)ispositi	ion of Claims	•			
5)□	Claim(s) 22-38 and 40-47 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 22-38, 40-47 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Applicati	ion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
riority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	,			
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority documents  Certified copies of the priority documents  Copies of the certified copies of the prioricy application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
2)	the of References Cited (FTO-692) the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) the No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		

# DETAILED ACTION

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 22-26, 29-31, 33, 34, 36-38, 40-43, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoffmann et al (5534022). Hoffmann shows in figure 13 the use of a distal ring electrode, 38, coil electrode, 20, proximal ring electrode, 36, and another proximal ring electrode as element 20'. Hoffmann also shows the use of electrode connector, e.g. 27/26/29, in figures 4, 5, or 7 and incorporates by reference 08/018832 (patent 5385578) to describe how the electrode is welded/adhered/connected to the conductor. In addition, Hoffman is capable of meeting the functional use recitations presented in the claims of being used for insertion through the sacrum into position for stimulation of one or more sacral nerves without causing damage since Hoffmann's lead is of a similar size (about 2.5 mm) and shape as the applicants lead and Hoffmann's lead is very flexible and used in the veins and the heart (e.g. figures 9, 10, column 3,etc.). Finally, Hoffmann's coil electrode, 20, includes a wire coil since it is a "coil" electrode that is made of wire coils (e.g. col. 6).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3762

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 28, 32, 35, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hoffmann.

Hoffman discloses the claimed invention having a diameter of "about 2.5 mm" which meets the limitation of the applicants claim language of "about 2 mm" and shows in figures 4, 5, 7 and 8 and describes in the incorporated reference, 08/018832, how the electrode is welded to the electrode connector as a butt weld.

In the alternative, Hoffmann discloses the claim invention except for the diameter of the coil being about 0.5 to about 2 mm and the connector being butt-welded to the electrode. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the implantable lead as taught by Hoffmann, with the diameter of the coil being about 0.5 to about 2 mm and the connector being butt-welded to the electrode since it was known in the art that implantable leads use: the diameter of the coil being about 0.5 to about 2 mm to provide an implantable lead that is small, unobtrusive, and does not interfere with the bodies

Art Unit: 3762

functions; and the connector being butt-welded to the electrode to provide a secure, reliable, and easily produced connection to connect two elements.

In addition, for the claimed 0.5-2 mm range, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art [*In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233] and it has been held that a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ (Please see MPEP 2144.05

Claims 27 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffmann.

Hoffman discloses the claimed invention except for the length of the coil electrode to be 0.1 to 1.5 inches. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the implantable lead as taught by Hoffmann, with the length of the coil electrode to be 0.1 to 1.5 inches since it was known in the art that coil electrodes are provided in the length of 0.1 to 1.5 inches to allow the coil electrode to be placed near the area that needs stimulation without needing the precise placement of say a point electrode and/or to provide the appropriate stimulation field to effectively stimulate a particular area of the body.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/2/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The argument that the defibrillation electrode of Hoffman is not analogous to the coil stimulation electrode recited in claim 22 is not persuasive since the claim only states that the

Art Unit: 3762

coil electrode includes a wire coil and an electrode connector, which Hoffman contains as described above in the rejection. In addition, it is unclear why the applicant is focusing on the sensing feature of Hoffman's defibrillation electrode since a "defibrillation" electrode is meant to deliver stimulation to the body. It is noted that the parameters of the stimulation have not been set forth, that electrodes are meant to deliver a range of stimulation energies, from pacing to defibrillation, and that the claim is a open ended "comprising" claim and does not preclude the use of the electrode for sensing. The argument that Hoffman's electrode in not capable of meeting the functional use recitations presented in the claim(s) is not persuasive. As set forth in the above rejections, Hoffman's range of "about 2.5 mm" is similar to applicants size of "about 2.0 mm" and Hoffman's lead is flexible (e.g. col. 3, claim 19 of Hoffman, etc) and similar in shape. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The argument that Hoffman's electrode 20' is not a ring electrode is not persuasive since Hoffman's electrode is circular shaped (i.e. a ring), a ring is defined as one spiral of a helix/spiral (such as Hoffman's), the art recognized definition of a ring electrode also includes coil electrodes, and/or Hoffman's electrode is not just comprised of the wire coils, but also the conductive ring shaped element 28. The argument that the modifications suggested in the 103 rejections would render the lead of Hoffman unsuitable for its intended purposes is not persuasive because the applicant has not provided any reasoning why it would render the lead unsuitable for its intended purposes, since using smaller leads, such as about 2.0

mm, and an electrode length of 0.1-1.5 inches is well known in the art (as shown by the evidence previously provided), and since these modifications do not render the lead unsuitable.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R. Evanisko whose telephone number is 571 272 4945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571 272 4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/843,051

Art Unit: 3762

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

George R Evanisko Primary Examiner Art Unit 3762

GRE 7/26/07